

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. The Applicant has amended claims 1-7 and canceled claims 8 and 9. The Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully provides the following remarks for consideration and requests the allowance of claims 1-7 and 10 in view of the remarks..

A. Priority

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for identifying that a certified copy of the priority application 0202792-8 has not been filed. The Applicant will file a certified copy of the priority application in due course.

B. Objection to Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.83 (a) as failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The Applicant has amended claims 2 and 3 to address this objection. Accordingly, the Applicant believes the objection has been overcome and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has also requested that labels be added to the reference numbers for easy identification of the components of each figure. The Applicant has filed replacement drawings that comply with the Examiner's request. Accordingly, the objection is believed to be overcome and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

C. Objection to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the title of the invention as failing to be descriptive. The Applicant has amended the title to make it more descriptive. Accordingly, the Examiner's objection is believed to be overcome and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has also objected to the specification under 37 C.F.R. 1.75 (d)(1) as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. The Applicant has amended claims 3 and 7 and canceled claim 8 to address this objection. Accordingly, the objection to the specification is believed to be overcome and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner also requested that the specification be amended to show where the detailed description of Figure 5 begins. The Applicant has amended the specification to comply with the Examiner's request.

D. Objection to the Claims

The Examiner objected to claim 1 for having a typographical error and failing to be clear to read. Claim 5 has been objected to as lacking antecedent basis. The Applicant has amended claims 1 and 5 to correct these errors. Accordingly, the Applicant believes that the objections have been overcome and requests withdrawal of the objection.

E. Rejection under 35. USC §112

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 7, 8, and 9 under 35. USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that

the applicant regards as the invention. Claim 3 has been rejected as failing to provide sufficient antecedent basis for a limitation in the claim. The Applicant has amended claim 3 to correct the failure to provide sufficient antecedent basis. Claim 7 has been rejected as failing to provide sufficient antecedent basis for the term “granularity” and “low granularity” in the claim. The Applicant has amended the claim to remove the limitations.

Claims 7, 8, and 9 recite the limitations “high” and “low.” The Applicant has canceled claims 8 and 9 and amended claim 7. Accordingly, the objections are believed to be overcome and withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

E. Rejection under 35 USC §102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6 under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Knapp et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,826,072.

Claim 1, as amended, now recites that an event control unit is arranged to recognize an event that initiates processing by the event control unit, wherein the event is an input signal and to control processing to be carried out as a consequence of the event while fulfilling the time performance constraints, wherein a pulse package held in the event control unit includes an event operand operable to identify the input signal to initiate processing by the event control unit and a delay operand that defines a stop condition for a counter in the event control unit. The present invention allows for the selection of what input signal will trigger the initiation of processing by the event control unit. The input signal is associated with a pulse package that includes an operand that defined the input signal as the event to initiate execution of the event control unit as well as a delay operand that specifies a time constraint.

Knapp does not teach the invention as claimed in claim 1. Knapp merely teaches a DSP for performing real-time functions and that is responsive to interrupt signals. Knapp fails to teach an event control unit as claimed in claim 1. Accordingly, Knapp does not teach or suggest the invention of claim 1.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 2-6 are not taught or suggested for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1.

E. Rejection under 35 USC §103

The Examiner rejected claims 7-9 under 35 USC §103 as being anticipated by Knapp et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,826,072 in view of Moorer U.S. Patent No. 4,497,023 and in further view of Morrison et al. U.S. Patent No. 4,847,755.

As discussed above Knapp fails to teach the invention of claim 1. Moorer does not cure the deficiencies of Knapp. Moorer teaches the use of time performance constraints. Moorer, however does not teach an event control unit as claimed in claim 1. Accordingly, the combination of Knapp and Moorer fails to teach the invention of claim 1.

Morrison also does not cure the deficiencies of Knapp and Moorer. Accordingly, the combination of Knapp, Moorer and Morrison does not teach the invention of claim 1. Claim 7-9 depend from claim 1 respectively. Accordingly, claims 7-9 are not taught alone or in combination by Knapp, Moorer and Morrison.

CONCLUSION

All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that the present amendments still do not resolve all of the issues regarding patentability of the pending claims, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorneys to discuss any remaining issues. A Petition for a three month Extension of Time is submitted herewith. No other fees are believed to be due at this time. Should any fee be required, however, please charge such fee to Bingham McCutchen, LLP Deposit Account No. 195127, Order No. 25880.0067.

Respectfully submitted,
Bingham McCutchen, LLP

Dated: August 30, 2006

By:



Chadwick A. Jackson, Registration No. 46,495
Bingham McCutchen LLP
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 373-6661 Telephone
(202) 295-8478 Facsimile